S.B.CR MISC. BAIL APPLICATION NO.2626/2006

Date : 10.07.2006

HON'BLE MR. SATYA PRAKASH PATHAK, J.

Mr. S.L. Jain for the applicant.
Mr. V.R. Mehta, Public Prosecutor for State.

I have heard learned counsel for the applicant as well as the learned Public Prosecutor for the State and carefully gone through the case diary and the impugned order.

Learned counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant is not beneficiary in this case, therefore, he may be granted anticipatory bail.

On the other hand, learned Public Prosecutor submits that on account of forgery committed the complaint has been put to loss of Rs.10,17,000/- i.e. the amount financed in relation to purchase of truck Ashok Leyland.

I have considered the submissions made before me. In the instant case, Rajesh was introduced as Narendra Kumar by the applicant and forgery was committed.

In view of above, I do not find it to be a fit case to extend benefit of anticipatory bail to the applicant. Accordingly, the bail application moved under by the applicant under Section 438 Cr.P.C. is rejected.

(SATYA PRAKASH PATHAK), J.